COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Ensuring Educator Excellence

CTC ACCREDITATION SITE VISITS

YEAR OUT PRE-VISIT HANDOUTS

Click on links below to go directly to each handout. To return to Table of Contents, click on Alt and Left Arrow Keys.

Schedule Samples: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html

1. Hotel-Meals Site Visit Planning Guide 2013-14

Institution	
State Consultant	
Total Number of Team Members	
Site Visit Dates:	
	☐ **Sunday-Wednesday** **Or** ☐ **Monday-Thursday**
Does the contract require board approval?	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

Contract Information:

	Dean/Director	**Accreditation Contact**	**Fiscal Person**	**Person Signing the Contract**
Name				
Title				
Phone				
Fax				
Email				
Mail address				

Information above is due to CTC a minimum of 1 week prior to the 3-6 Month Phone Call

Send Information to Brenda Cunningham (bcunningham@ctc.ca.gov) or Lori Gonzales (lgonzales@ctc.ca.gov)

If you have any questions, please talk with your assigned accreditation consultant

For the 3-6 Month Out phone call, please have the following information ready	
A. Lodging: Hotel name	
Address	
Phone #	
Lodging Rate (include tax & occupancy tax)	
Number of rooms on hold (only those reimbursed by CTC contract)	
Tax Exemption Accepted	☐ Yes ☐ No
B. Meeting Room Rate (include service charges and tax)	
C. Parking Fee/car/night	

1. Hotel-Meals Site Visit Planning Guide 2013-14

A. Lodging

Lodging for Accreditation Site Visit Team Members—Please consider the following requirements when setting up lodging arrangements

* **Within state rates**—see below
* Queen/King room, no smoking, for each team member
* Close proximity to campus
* Restaurant on site or within walking distance
* Meeting room—24 hour hold must have free internet connectivity
* Internet capabilities in lodging rooms and close to campus, transportation from airport are preferred (CTC does not pay for Internet charges)

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing will reimburse the host institution for all team members and staff according to the information below:

Lodging Details to Consider

Total rooms needed:	Arrive*	# of Nights Lodging	Room Rate	Room Tax Rate
Number of Team Members + Consultant	Arrival date and time	Total number of nights	Should Reflect State Rate	Tax Rate* Percent plus Occupancy Tax

*Rarely a team member might need to arrive on Saturday (Sunday) afternoon due to flights or distance.
*Check with hotel to determine if they honor the "state tax exemption."

Confirm that it is the <u>State Government</u> rate!

All California counties not listed below	Actual expense up to **$84 per night, plus tax**
Los Angeles and **San Diego** counties	Actual expense up to **$110 per night, plus tax**
Alameda, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and **San Mateo** Counties	Actual expense up to **$140 per night, plus tax**

B. Meeting Room at the Hotel:

Total days needed:	Arrival*	Room Rate	Service Charges & Tax
	Arrival date and time	Note if cost is different for ½ days	Service Charges & Tax Rate Percent

What is the daily rate for the meeting room? $_________ (some days are ½ rate because of ½ day usage)
This needs to be a 24 hour hold room! Meeting room is needed from Sunday noon through Wednesday noon (or Monday noon-Thurs noon).

Does the Meeting Room have free Internet Access? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐
(CTC does not pay for Internet charges)

C. Parking:
Is there a Parking fee at the Hotel? If so, please notify your consultant $_____/day

D. Meals:
Decide if each meal will be at the institution or at the hotel—if at the hotel, will the meal be in the contract or reimbursed to team members on a TEC

Breakfast	Actual expense **up to $6**
Lunch	Actual expense **up to $10**
Dinner	Actual expense **up to $18**

Be aware there may be team members with vegetarian or special dietary needs

1st Day: Lunch and Dinner
2nd Day: Breakfast*, Lunch and Dinner
3rd Day: Breakfast*, Lunch, and Dinner
4th Day: Breakfast* and Lunch

*A **continental breakfast** in not adequate for team members—breakfast needs to include, at minimum, protein (eggs, yogurt), fruit, and a starch

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95811 (916) 324-8002 Fax (916) 324-8927
www.ctc.ca.gov
Professional Services Division

2. Site Visit Documentation

The Site Visit Documentation (SVD) is composed of a number of documents and is used by the accreditation site visit team members both before and during the site visit:

1. Common Standards Narrative
2. Documentation linked from the Common Standards Narrative
3. An updated response to all applicable Preconditions is due a minimum of 6 months prior to an accreditation site visit and should be submitted to accreditation@ctc.ca.gov
4. Program Summary for each approved educator preparation program
5. Program Narratives* addressing all adopted program standards for each Commission-approved educator preparation program
6. Documentation linked from each of the Program narratives.
7. Program Assessment Feedback for each of the Commission-approved educator preparation programs
8. Biennial Reports submitted since the last site visit (Section A, for each approved program and Section B, institutional summary)
9. Feedback from CTC for each Biennial Report

There are a variety of ways that an institution may provide this information:

A. The preferred plan for the SVD is that each of these documents and additional supporting documentation is posted on an institutional web page that is ready for the team to use 60 days prior to the beginning of the site visit. If additional documentation is identified and posted once the web page has been initially posted, be sure to put a "Posted date" next to the link.

B. If the web page plan does not work for an institution, then all documentation listed above may be put on a flash drive or CD and sent through US Mail to the state consultant, team lead, and team members. The mailing needs to scheduled so that the flash drive/CD arrives 60 days prior to the site visit. If additional documentation is identified once the flash drive/CD has been sent, it is important for the institution to get the information to the consultant and team.

* Narratives should be final narratives with all edits and additions integrated into the normal text of the document. During Program Assessment programs usually need to modify the initial narrative and when it is posted/provided for the site visit team, it should be in final form with no tracked edits or text highlighted from the Program Assessment process.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95811 (916) 324-8002 Fax (916) 324-8927
www.ctc.ca.gov
Professional Services Division

3. Preparing a Preconditions Report

If there are questions on the following information, please contact Teri Ackerman, tackerman@ctc.ca.gov or if you have an assigned CTC Consultant, please contact the consultant.

Between six and twelve months before the scheduled site visit, institutional officials prepare a *Precondition Report* to be submitted to the Commission. This brief report describes the institutional mission and includes information about institutional demographics, special emphasis programs, and other unique features of the institution. The *Precondition Report* is a required part of the accreditation cycle and is designed to: 1) ensure compliance with certain laws, regulations, and Commission policies, and 2) help the Commission (in discussion with the dean or director) determine the type, size and complexity of the programs to be reviewed and the structure, size and expertise of the review team to be selected. The *Precondition Report* includes the following three components.

1. Special Characteristics of the Institution
2. Response to Preconditions for all Approved Programs
3. Matrix of Approved Programs, Current Enrollment and Completers

1. Special Characteristics of the Institution: The institution notes any special characteristics about its credential programs that would affect the composition of the team, the organization of the visit, or the development of the team schedule. Offering programs at multiple sites, the use of unusual delivery formats-including technology, and/or unusual staffing patterns are of particular interest to the Commission and may require particular expertise among the review team members. Institutions with multiple-site programs must include specific information about the administrative relationships among the various locales and options. It is possible that there may not be any special characteristics for the institution or that the characteristics have been addressed in the Biennial Report. If this is the case, state that there are no special characteristics or that they have been detailed in the Biennial Report.

2. Response to Preconditions: In its *Precondition Report,* the institution includes its response to accreditation preconditions established by state laws and the Commission. The institution must respond to preconditions for all credential programs offered by the institution. The Preconditions may be found on the Site Visit web page (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-site-visits.html) or within each approved program's Standards Handbook.

3. Matrix of Approved Programs, Current Enrollment, and Completers: The institution must provide a table that clearly shows the approved credential programs, the delivery model—traditional or intern, and the location the program is offered. In addition for each of the programs-delivery models-locations, the table must provide the current enrollment and the number of program completers from the prior year. An example of such a table is provided below. An institution may use this table or another that provides the same information.

Sample Matrix of Approved Programs, Current Enrollment and Completers

Approved Credential Programs offered by Institution
Preconditions Report
2013-14

Credential Program	Delivery Model	Location	Current Enrollment	Completers 2012-13
Multiple Subject	Traditional	Main Campus		
	Intern	Main Campus		
	Intern	Satellite		
Single Subject	Traditional	Main Campus		
	Intern	Main Campus		
Preliminary Administrative Services	Traditional	Main Campus		
	Traditional	Satellite		
Reading Certificate	Traditional	Main Campus		
	Traditional	Satellite		

Add additional rows for all approved programs offered by the institution.

4. A Full Program Review Focusing on an Approved Educator Preparation Program Compared to the Program Sampling Approach

The Program Assessment process allows readers, in pairs, to carefully review program narratives and supporting documentation prior to the site visit. If the documents provide sufficient description of how the standards are addressed and supporting documentation corroborates the program design, the readers can find the standards to be Preliminarily Aligned. Once that happens, the program will not receive an intensive, focused review at the Site Visit but will complete a Program Sampling Review. In the event some concerns are identified by the readers despite the Sponsor's provisions of additional information, the sponsor will have the time between the PA and the SV to provide additional information to address those problems.

However if the program sponsor does not provide adequate documentation that the program is preliminarily aligned with the standards, the Site Visit team will include an additional team member who will focus, intensively and exclusively, on the specific program. This will include reviewing program narratives and documentation, and interviewing representatives of the program.

Program Sampling Review	Full Program Review
Programs are grouped (3-4 programs) and reviewed by one team member	Each program is reviewed by a single team member with extensive expertise in the content area. The evidence is shared with the full team for decisions on each standard.
Interviews are conducted across the group of programs (with candidates, completers, faculty, supervisors, employers, advisory board)	Interviews (with candidates, completers, faculty, supervisors, employers, advisory board) are conducted focusing specifically on the one program
Interviews focus on the '10,000 foot level' across 3 categories: Program Design, Course of Study, and Candidate Competence	Interviews focus on the specifics of the adopted standards, and review is conducted on a standard-by-standard basis
Interviewer is listening for any issues to 'bubble up' and if no issues arise, then the programs are deemed to be meeting the standards.	Interviewer is probing each concept in the adopted standards to ascertain if the each standard is met.
If an issue appears to arise, the team member will talk with the team lead and consultant as soon as the issue appears. The team discusses the issue and decides if there is sufficient evidence to move to the standard level.	
If it is agreed that the team will go to the standard level, the team leader and consultant notify the institution. Team members will conduct further interviews on the specifics of the standard or standards that address the issue.	In the full review the team member will focus on all aspects of the standards and probe to confirm whether an issue truly exists or whether it is an outlier. All evidence is presented to the full team for discussion and standard decisions.
The program narrative is reviewed 2 years prior to the site visit through the Program Assessment process and all or almost all standards are *Preliminarily Aligned* prior to the site visit. The team member usually does not read the program narratives for the cluster's programs but narratives need to be posted for reference.	The program narrative and supporting documentation is provided to the team member a minimum of 60 days prior to the site visit. The program narrative is reviewed thoroughly by the team member prior to the site visit and serves as the initial basis for the interviews conducted at the visit.
A 3-4 page Program Summary is provided to the team 60 days prior to the visit.	A 3-4 page Program Summary is provided to the team 60 days prior to the visit.

PROGRAM SPONSOR ALERT

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

Date:	July 5, 2012	Number:	12-08
Subject:	Biennial Reports: Pilot of Updated Section B and Additional Guidance for Institutions and Review Teams for Common Standard 2		

Summary
Biennial Reports are a key component of the Commission's accreditation system and have been in place since the 2007-08 year. Section A of the Biennial Report requires institutions to provide program specific data for each Commission-approved educator preparation program. Section B is a summary of the institution's data and activities across the unit, including all Commission-approved programs.

This alert provides directions for the updated ***Institutional Summary and Plan of Action.*** The updated directions provide guidance to support each institution in documenting that the Unit's assessment and improvement system is in operation. In addition, this alert provides an expanded description of Common Standard 2.

Background
A review of the first few years of implementation of the biennial report indicates that, in general, institutions are using Section A effectively to demonstrate that each of its programs are collecting, analyzing and using candidate assessment and program effectiveness data at the program level. However, the review noted that additional guidance to assist institutions in completing Section B, the institutional summary and plan of action, would be beneficial. To address this, the COA has approved a pilot of an updated *Section B – Institutional Summary and Plan of Action.*

For those submitting a Biennial Report in 2012, the updated ***Institutional Summary and Plan of Action*** (Appendix A) is voluntary but highly encouraged. For those institutions submitting reports in August 2012 who are willing to pilot the new Section B, an addendum with this information may be submitted any time prior to December 15, 2012. Beginning with the Fall 2013 Biennial Reports, the updated ***Institutional Summary and Plan of Action*** will be required.

Additional Guidance for Institutions and Review Teams Regarding Common Standard 2
Common Standard 2 requires all Commission-approved institutions to collect, analyze and utilize data at both the program and the unit level. It reads as follows:

COMMON STANDARD 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

> The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Provided in Appendix B is additional guidance related to Common Standard 2 for use by institutions and accreditation review teams. This document was developed by staff and accreditation site visit team members after a number of years of reviewing different institutions' implementation of Common Standard 2. The Committee on Accreditation has reviewed the expanded description of the standard and approved it. This expanded description is being integrated into the Accreditation Handbook.

Page 1 of the expanded description of Common Standard 2 describes the steps an institution would need to complete to fully meet the standard. Each approved institution must be able to identify when and how each of the identified activities takes place.

The second page of the expanded description was developed to assist accreditation site visit team members to understand the complexities of the standard and to provide guidance as the team members come to a standard finding for Common Standard 2. Institutions sponsoring Commission-approved educator preparation may find this page helpful as well.

References
Biennial Reports Staff: BiennialReports@ctc.ca.gov

Biennial Reports web page: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html

Contact Information
The Professional Services Division provides a full list of topic-specific dedicated, email addresses as well as program areas with the most up-to-date Commission staff members' email addresses at: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PSD-contact.html.

Biennial Report

SECTION B

(For Biennial Reports submitted in 2012, the Updated Section B is voluntary. If an institution elects not to complete the Updated Section B, please submit information for the original Section B which is noted below.)

<u>Original</u> INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

(Required for all program sponsors offering more than one credential or certificate program)

1-3 pages

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all programs within that institution. Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

<u>Updated</u> INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

(Required for all program sponsors starting in 2013)

1-3 pages

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all Commission-approved educator preparation programs within that institution. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

1) If you have a one page graphic of your Unit assessment system, please provide it. If not, please **briefly outline** your system.

2) To support the documentation of your Unit assessment system in action, please provide a table that shows a sample of the actions the unit has taken in the past two years and link the action with the data and analysis that led to the action. If your institution only offers one approved educator preparation program, this information may have been provided in Section A. Do not repeat the information here, instead please refer the reader back to Section A. (Sample table provided on the next page.)

3) Please note any implications for your institution related to the Common Standards based on the data presented in this Biennial Report. This will require a review of the information presented in the Biennial Report with the concepts in the Commission's Common Standards (1-Leadership, 2-Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, 3-Resources, 4-Faculty and Instructional Personnel, 5-Admission, 6-Advice and Assistance, 7-Field Experience, 8-District Employed Supervisors, and 9-Candidate Assessment). (Sample table provided on the next page.)

2) Documentation of Actions Taken in the Unit Assessment System
Based on the Analysis of Data Collected (2010-11 and 2011-12)

Action Taken	Date	Data Source(s)	Analysis Leading to the Action

3) Common Standard Implications for 2012-13
Based on the Analysis of Data Presented in the 2012 Biennial Report

Identified Issue	Program(s) Involved	Data Source(s)	Area of Strength or Area to Improve	Applicable Common Standard (s)

STANDARD 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

A Unit Assessment System is **a single integrated, comprehensive system** that takes into account the collection, analysis, and utilization of data, **by each program individually and by the unit across all programs**, for every credential program offered by an institution.

In developing a deeper understanding of the language in Common Standard 2, consider the following regarding collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data at both the program and Unit level.

	Collect **'Gather data'**	**Analyze** **'Organize data'**	**Utilize** **'Drive decision making'**
Unit	• Gather data across all of an institution's approved programs related to the Common Standards: 1) Leadership, 2) Assessment System, 3) Resources, 4) Faculty, 5) Admission, 6) Advice & Assistance, 7) Field Experience, 8) District-Employed Supervisors, and 9) Candidate Competence. • Collect data in an ongoing and comprehensive manner.	• Organize the data within the unit and across all of the approved program(s). • Discuss the data with faculty and others within the unit and all of the approved program(s). • Draw conclusions from the data to inform decision-making across the unit and all of the approved program(s).	• Use the analysis of the data for unit and program(s) improvement purposes. • Document the cycle of improvement decision-making for the unit and its programs. • Document actions taken, the basis of those actions and how/when the results will be reviewed next at the unit level.
Program	• Gather data related to the candidate competencies identified in the Program Standards • Gather data related to program effectiveness. • Collect from candidates, completers, employers, field supervisors and faculty in an ongoing and comprehensive manner.	• Organize the data within the program. • Discuss the data with faculty and others working with the program. • Draw conclusions from the data to inform decision-making within the program.	• Use the analysis of the data for program improvement purposes. • Document actions taken, the basis of those actions and how/when the results will be reviewed next at the program level.

At some institutions, each program has its own program evaluation and improvement process in place but the unit evaluation and improvement process has not been developed or has been developed but not yet implemented.

When Common Standard 2 was newly adopted, staff and members of the BIR talked about the standard as having two main parts—the program evaluation and improvement process and the unit evaluation and improvement process. If only one of the parts was in operation, usually the program evaluation and improvement system, then the standard was at least ***Met with Concerns***.

As the Common Standards have been implemented for a few years, it has become clear that program evaluation systems operating in isolation from one another **do not collectively provide evidence of a single unit assessment system**—regardless of how effectively they are operating. In this case, the fact that there are data being collected, analyzed, and utilized (CAU'ed) at the unit level (in isolation from program improvement efforts) is insufficient evidence of a unit assessment system under the standard.

The standard requires that the unit "*implement* an assessment and evaluation system," but teams are constantly agonizing over *how much* of the system needs to be fully operational in order for the standard to be met. Does "implements" mean that the institution has *initiated* the process of *collecting* data on program effectiveness and unit operations, or does it mean that the unit has *completed* the process of *collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data over a sufficiently long period of time to demonstrate that the process is "ongoing?"*

Guidance for Coming to a Standard Finding on Common Standard 2

Unit Assessment and Evaluation (unit operations—Common Standards)			**Program Assessment and Evaluation** (candidates and completers)			**Common Standard 2 Finding**
Collect	**Analyze**	**Utilize**	**Collect**	**Analyze**	**Utilize**	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	**Met**[1]
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	**Met with Concerns**[2]
Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	**Not Met**[3]
Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	
No	No	No	No	No	No	

This table provides examples but is not intended to be a complete listing of all possible combinations

[1] One comprehensive system is operating that takes into account the collection, analysis, and utilization of data, individually and across the unit and all programs offered by an institution.

[2] Most of these rows describe a unit that meets the program CAU criteria on a program-by-program basis, as well as performing CAU on some aspects of unit operations. The program data are used within, but not across programs; the unit data may be used to guide decisions at the unit level through processes separate from those used for program-by-program decision-making. In this case, a reviewer may find evidence of data-informed improvements at both the program and unit level, but they would be the result of "parallel processing" rather than an actual unit assessment system.

[3] These rows are variations on units that do not have a unit assessment system or that may have *designed* but have not *implemented* a unit assessment system. Many accreditation visits encounter "work in progress" with regard to unit assessment. If there is no integrated system that is in operation at some level, the standard is Not Met.

6. Steps in the Review of Program and Common Standards Prior to and During the Accreditation Site Visit

Review of Each Approved Program

Program Assessment Begins	Feedback to Institution	Additional Narrative and Supporting Documentation Submitted	All Standards *Preliminarily Aligned*	Team Gathers and Reviews Evidence	Standard Findings for all Programs considered in the team's decisions on CTC Common Standards and Accreditation Recommendation
2 ½ years prior to the site visit	Reader Feedback provided to the Institution	If needed, additional clarifying narrative and supporting documentation is submitted for standards that are not yet *Preliminarily Aligned*	Institution should review Program Summary for accuracy and completeness	Team makes decisions on all Program Standards	
Fall 2011	Iterative Process until all standards are *Preliminarily Aligned* or only 6 months remain until the site visit		Minimum of 6 months prior to the site visit	Site Visit	

Review of the Institution Against the Common Standards

Site Visit Documentation	Off-Site Review by Team	Team Phone Call	Information Shared with Institution	Team Gathers and Reviews Evidence	Findings for all CTC Common Standards and Accreditation Recommendation
60 days prior to the visit	Team begins reviewing the narrative and all available exhibits	Team discusses and identifies questions and evidence needed	Team Lead shares list of questions and evidence identified by the team	On site review focuses on issues	
December 2013 - April 2014	As soon as SVD is available	2 weeks -1 month prior to the visit	After the Team Phone Call	Site Visit	

VIOLET COHORT (41)

California State University (3)
Fresno (S)*
San Francisco State
Monterey Bay (S)*

University of California (3)
Davis
Irvine
San Diego

Other Sponsors (1)
Boston Reed College#

Private/Independents (8)
Antioch University
Argosy University
Claremont Graduate Univ.
Hebrew Union College
Hope International Univ.
La Sierra University
National University (S)*!
Pacific Oaks College
University of Southern California (F)*!

Local Education Agencies (26)
Antelope Valley Union HSD (601)
Compton USD (434)

Local Education Agencies continued
Cupertino Union SD (236)
El Dorado COE (105)
Envision Schools (235)
Escondido Union HSD (507)
ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD (436)
Imperial COE (511)
Irvine USD (535)
Keppel Union SD (607)
Kern County SOS (307)
Los Banos USD (325)
Murrieta Valley USD (616)
New Haven USD (211)
Newport-Mesa USD (513)#
Norwalk-La Mirada USD (418)#
Palo Alto USD (213)
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD (416)
Sacramento City USD (116)
Salinas Union HSD-Adult School
San Francisco USD (215)
Sanger USD (324)
Sequoia Union HSD (227)
Selma USD (316)
Washington USD (125)
Wm. S. Hart Union HSD (429)

Academic Year (AY)	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**
Cycle Year	5	5	6	7	1	2	2
Accreditation Activity	Institutional Data Collection **Biennial Report**	Institutional Data Collection	Institutional Data Collection **Site Visit**	Institutional Data Collection Site Visit follow-up	Institutional Data Collection **Biennial Report**	Institutional Data Collection	Institutional Data Collection **Biennial Report**
Due to CTC	Biennial Report (Data for AY 2010-11, 2011-12)	Nothing	• Preconditions Report -6-12 months in advance of site visit • Self Study-2 months before site visit	7th Year Follow Up, if applicable	Biennial Report (Data for AY 2013-14 and 2015-16)	Nothing	Biennial Report (Data for AY 2016-17, 2017-18)
Due dates	Aug. 2012 or Sept. 2012	None		Up to 1 Year after Site Visit, if applicable	Aug. 2016, Sept. 2015, or Oct. 2016	None	Aug. 2018, Oct. 2018, or Dec. 2018
COA/CTC Feedback What & When	-CTC Staff feedback in Aug: 6-8 wks Sept: 6-8 wks	None	Accreditation decision made by COA	COA Review of 7th Year Report, if applicable	-CTC Staff feedback in Aug: 8-10 wks Sept: 10-12 wks Oct: 12-16 wks	None	-CTC Staff feedback in Aug: 8-10 wks Oct: 10-12 wks Dec: 12-16 wks
Notes							

*CTC/NCATE Joint Visit (F= Fall; S= Spring) ~ CTC/TEAC Concurrent Visit *! = Initial Visit* #Inactive *Updated July 2012*